DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 330 048 EA 022 757

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | The Congruence between Instructional Support Services and Core Classroom Programs: Regent's Policy Paper. |
| INSTITUTION | New York State Education Dept., Albany. Office of School Improvement Grants Management and Compliance. |
| PUB DATE | Sep 90 |
| NOTE | 23p. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Descriptive (141) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC01 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Cooperative Programs; *Core Curriculum; *Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Integrated Curriculum; Learning Processes; *Program Development; Special Education; State Departments of Education |
| IDENTIFIERS | *New York; *Outcome Based Education |

ABSTRACT

Fragmentation in the learning process occurs when support programs evolve into self-contained instructional systems and lose sight of the original goal of improving performance in the core classroom program. The lack of planned coordination of instructional objectives results in "cognitive confusion" for students. The New York State Board of Regents has worked with school district personnel to develop a "congruence" process to ensure integration of support services and core programs for students falling behind at school. The congruence process focuses on aligning curriculum and instruction (articulation) and cooperative planning between classroom teachers and professional support staff (coordination). This policy paper formally adopts the congruence process and recommends specific strategies for ensuring shared student learning outcomes and ongoing coordination and articulation among all support services and classroom developmental programs. Three appendices contain 8 legal citations, assorted research findings, and 18 references. (MLH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

EA

ED330048

# REGENTS POLICY PAPER ON THE CONGRUENCE BETWEEN INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES AND CORE CLASSROOM PROGRAMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Trombly
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared by the
Office of School Improvement
Grants Management and Compliance

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**The University of the State of New York**
**The State Education Department**
**Albany, New York 12234**

**September 1990**

EA022757

# CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Overview | 1 |
| Introduction | 3 |
| Statement of the Problem | 5 |
| Rationale for Action | 6 |
| Policy | 8 |
| Recommended Strategies | 9 |
| Appendices | 11 |
| A. Legal Citations | 12 |
| B. Research Findings | 15 |
| C. References | 18 |

# OVERVIEW

There has been consistent documentation within the past few years indicating a lack of regular coordination between the core curriculum of the classroom and the instructional support programs in a building (Cohen, 1982; Johnston, et.al., 1985; Allington and Shake, 1986). Often teachers appear to have no common instructional framework to guide collaborative program planning (Allington and Broikou, 1988; Walp and Walmsley, 1989). Allington and Shake (1986) reported that in many schools in which they served as consultants, "students and parents perceive no relationship between what is presented in a general education class and what is taught in the compensatory or special class." Evidence indicates that, typically, the classroom teacher and instructional support teacher have different instructional goals for the same student on the same day. The different goals, approaches, and materials used in each setting result in a fragmented instructional program for the student.

School districts have an obligation to organize instructional support services in order to increase the likelihood that each child's learning and achievement improves continuously with the eventual goal of exiting the support program altogether. This requires local districts to establish and apply high standards of both EQUITY and EXCELLENCE in the education of EACH CHILD served.

In New York State the Part 100 Regulations of the Commissioner of Education require each school district to improve pupil performance for all students. In the years ahead, each school building will develop plans to meet this requirement. The progress of children and youth placed at-risk must be assessed and included as part of this improvement plan.

Additionally, in the reauthorized Federal Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments passed in April of 1988, the law states that in order for students to succeed in their regular program, local educational agencies must provide frequent and regular coordination between the compensatory program and the regular instructional program [Sections 1001(b) and 1012(c)(3)]. School districts nationally are required to address this issue.

Information gathered over the last few years has clearly shown that the most effective support programs are those which are closely coordinated with a coherent core program and have as their primary goal the success of the student in that program. To ensure that students statewide have the opportunity to achieve this goal, it is important that all units throughout the State Education Department involved in elementary and secondary grants compliance, curriculum, instruction, standards of excellence, school improvement, and support services work collaboratively to create conditions that foster quality coordinated programs both at State and local levels.

Education Department staff in recognition of this concern have been actively involved with school district personnel in the examination of strategies for improving student achievement in the classroom. A process called "congruence" has been introduced comprehensively across the State to ensure the integration of support services and core programs for students falling behind in school. The congruence process focuses on the alignment of curriculum and instruction (articulation) and the cooperative planning between the classroom teachers and professional support staff (coordination).

The CONGRUENCE PROCESS is intended to promote local district development of programs that are effective in enabling the student to move smoothly from the support program into the core program. To achieve this, the following must be in place:

1. An outcomes-based "core curriculum" that includes special activities to meet the needs of all students.

2. Instructional strategies in both support and base school programs that include techniques tailored to benefit students experiencing learning difficulties.

3. A comprehensive core program appropriately structured (i.e., developmentally based) so that the student is able to participate actively in the regular classroom while also receiving support services in those areas in which he/she needs assistance.

To further the process, this policy paper was developed to discuss the problem of program fragmentation and describe the congruence process as an alternative.

The congruence concept supports the central theme expressed in recent reports to the Commissioner and Board of Regents including: the policy paper on Educating Children and Youth At-Risk; the Regents Policy Paper on Middle Level Education; the Regents Policy Paper and Proposed Action for Bilingual Education; an SED Report to the Regents on Compensatory Education; Status Report on the Excellence and Accountability Program; proposal to the Regents on Improving Public Elementary, Middle, and Secondary Results: A New Approach for the 1990s; and Draft of Proposed Regents Policy Paper on Early Childhood Education, Birth Through Age Nine. All of these papers echo the premise that all students must have an opportunity for participation in quality educational programs. The congruence process provides a framework for enhancing the development and implementation of coherent core programs for all students.

This policy paper formally adopts the congruence process, and recommends specific strategies for ensuring shared student learning outcomes and ongoing coordination and articulation among all support services and classroom developmental programs.

# INTRODUCTION

District allocation of time and resources is crucial for the improvement of curriculum and instruction (Cohen, Intilli and Robbins, 1978; Allington and Shake, 1986). Without program coordination, student progress may be less than optimal. This concept is supported by a number of researchers who have found that pullout supplementary reading programs with separate teachers, materials, and curricula rarely produce any reliable positive results (e.g., Leinhardt and Pallay, 1982).

During the past two years, a Department project called "Congruence" was developed to improve the effectiveness of instruction and curriculum for students. Congruence involves an integrated approach which includes learner outcomes common to both the classroom and support programs. Teachers are empowered to collaborate for the benefit of children who may need help in meeting core program expectations.

The following working definitions clarify the concept upon which the congruence process is based:

**Congruence** is the link between the core classroom program and support programs. The most important goal of congruence is to ensure student success in the core classroom program. Congruence results in an educational plan which includes individual learner outcomes common to both the core and support program. A congruent program is achieved through articulation and coordination.

**Articulation** occurs when district and building level staff align curriculum, instructional resources, methodology, and evaluation procedures.

**Coordination** occurs when district and building level administrators and staff cooperatively plan and implement core and support program activities to ensure student success.

**Core curriculum** is the basic content/course of study for a grade level/subject in a school, including the intended learner outcomes recommended by the State and developed at the school district level.

**Developmental programs** are interactive classroom programs designed to address core curriculum expectations developed by the school district, through varied instructional strategies and materials commensurate with the interests, developing abilities, and readiness levels of all students in the class.

**Instructional support programs** are supplementary services for eligible students placed at-risk. These services are extensions of the core classroom programs. Instructional support programs provide added instruction and further experiences to supplement teaching strategies and learning activities offered in developmental programs.

Although this policy paper addresses mainly instructional support services such as compensatory education programs, the Regents acknowledge the appropriateness of the congruence process in relation to the coordination of other educationally related support services (e.g., psychological services, counseling, family consultation services, etc.) and non-instructional support services such as preventive health services, pediatric evaluations, etc.

The **CONGRUENCE PROCESS** is a New York State initiative focusing on cooperative planning among administrators, staff, and parents to achieve **ARTICULATION** and **COORDINATION.**

The Congruence process has been planned collaboratively by the Bureaus of Grants Compliance, School Improvement, English Reading Education, Mathematics Education, Curriculum Development, and School and Categorical Programs Evaluation; professors from SUNY at Albany; and school district representatives. A Statewide Congruence Project Steering Committee was organized to develop a process and draft a handbook to be field tested during the 1987-88 school year. Thirty-eight pilot school districts were selected from across the State to receive inservice training and to develop programs which include articulation and coordination. Projects were created in the areas of reading, writing, mathematics, and bilingual/ESL services in various grades at the elementary and secondary levels. The pilot schools include small, medium, and large school districts from urban, suburban, and rural areas in New York State.

# STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Research shows that program fragmentation results in problems in the learning process. This fragmentation occurs when support programs evolve into self-contained instructional systems and lose sight of the original goal of improving performance in the core classroom program (Cohen, 1982; Johnston, et. al., 1985; Will, 1986). The lack of planned coordination of instructional objectives frequently results in "cognitive confusion" for students (Vernon, 1958; Downing, 1979; Allington and Shake, 1986).

On-site reviews of program activities in schools indicate that in the past a significant amount of time and effort has been devoted to improving the selection of eligible at-risk students and designing activities for these students. However, districts do experience, even now, difficulty in developing and implementing strategies to ensure that activities are consistent, coordinated, and supportive of those outcomes identified for the core school program. The goal is to improve programs for all students, especially those needing instructional support services. The problem is that core classroom programs and instructional support programs are not congruent.

# RATIONALE FOR ACTION

Both the federal Chapter 1 statute and State Pupils with Compensatory Educational Needs (PCEN) statute direct local school districts to coordinate the activities of the support program with those of the core school program. The overall goal, as described in the Chapter 1 statute (Section 1001(b)), is:

> "To improve the educational opportunities of educationally deprived children by helping these children -
>
> (1) Succeed in the regular program of the LEA;
> (2) Attain grade-level proficiency; and
> (3) Improve achievement in basic and more advanced skills."

This is the first time that the federal statute has included as a goal the success of the youngsters in the core program of the school. To assist LEAs in achieving this goal, both the federal and State statutes include directions that the support program and the core school program must be made congruent (Chapter 1 statute, section 1012(c)(3) and Commissioner's Regulations Part, 149-1.4(h) and Part 149-3.3).

The Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988 direct districts to

> "allocate time and resources for frequent and regular coordination of the curriculum under this Chapter with the regular instructional program."

The Commissioner's Regulations for PCEN programs further require districts to describe how the "delivery of services and assessment procedures will be planned and coordinated among the regular classroom teachers and remedial teachers, and, as appropriate, with the support services personnel funded from State apportionments for attendance improvement and dropout prevention and educationally related support services."

Also, the Regents Action Plan encourages "all regular and special education teachers...to coordinate a student's classroom work with his or her remedial work." Remedial specialists are directed to "work with the regular and special education teachers to provide the appropriate instruction as needed."

As districts move, however, toward implementing coordination they are faced with some of the following concerns: scheduling problems, added costs, and reduced instructional time for students with multiple needs.

Although many districts are meeting the general requirements of the laws and regulations through "pro-forma" methods of coordination, additional State-level policy statements provide school districts with the direction, flexibility, procedures, and assistance to improve core programs and implement "effective" approaches to coordination.

# POLICY

New York State is committed to improving educational outcomes for all students.

The following policy is recommended to eliminate program fragmentation, and to assist school districts to implement more effective support programs as well as core education programs:

> All schools will ensure that every child has access to and participates in an integrated core program that focuses on common learner outcomes. Specifically, schools must ensure that all students, including those receiving instructional support services, achieve expected knowledge and skill outcomes. Schools will establish support programs as a supplementary extension of the core classroom programs across grade levels, curriculum areas, and all professional support staff with the same purpose, to improve student outcomes.

Support programs can be made an extension of the core classroom program through a process of "congruence" to ensure success for all students in the developmental program. This process applies to all programs, including services for educationally disadvantaged students, limited English-proficient students, students receiving special education services, as well as any youth placed at-risk achieving at a level below their peers.

Programs are considered congruent when different teachers working with the same child offer activities and tasks that are mutually supportive and provide a coherent curricular focus. District and building level supervisory personnel are expected to allocate time and resources for comprehensive planning for staff, and to use observable criteria to determine the degree of curricular/instructional congruence existing between the instructional support services and core classroom programs.

# RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES

To implement this policy, the following strategies are suggested for State Education Department action:

1. **Expand** the role of the professional support staff (e.g., reading teachers, ESL teachers, math specialists, etc.) to include responsibility for congruence activities.

2. **Review** district and building curricula and instructional techniques to ensure that they reflect: (a) the developmental levels and needs of students in both the core classroom program and instructional support programs; and (b) the intended learner outcomes developed at the district level.

3. **Provide** inservice training workshops for all classroom teachers, special education teachers, and professional support staff to focus on the value of collaborative planning, conferencing, coordination of curriculum, etc. for all students.

4. **Assist** schools in developing an environment that encourages core classroom teachers and instructional support teachers to feel as equal partners.

5. **Assist** administrators in providing time and resources for "meaningful" coordination of all programs (including special education consultant teacher services). Develop a menu of successful scheduling techniques, conference topics, building teams, etc. for their use.

6. **Assist** districts to develop optional organizational patterns for providing instructional support services.

7. **Recommend** additional time management strategies for support services that do not compete with other programs (e.g., "in-class" models, extended school day, summer programs, etc.).

8. **Disseminate** information concerning successful modes for delivering coordinated instructional support services.

9. **Develop** State level procedures to coordinate the collection and analysis of evaluation data for compensatory programs with core classroom achievement data to determine the success of students receiving instructional support services.

10. **Engage** university professionals in an ongoing dialogue to provide opportunities for students in teacher education programs to: (a) become aware of the changing roles of classroom and support teachers; and (b) develop techniques for effective collaboration and coordination of instructional programs.

11. **Promote** the congruence philosophy statewide by incorporating it in technical assistance workshops and publications prepared by SED units, including preventive programs such as early childhood and parent partnership programs.

12. **Develop and Implement** SED procedures to assist school districts to prepare an outcomes-based local core program with a common focus, in each subject, that reflects the State syllabi, includes the written, taught, and tested curriculum, and acknowledges the developmental level of all students at each grade level.

13. **Direct** school districts to incorporate congruence procedures in their school improvement plans and Excellence and Accountability Program activities.

14. **Coordinate** existing grant resources to assist schools to provide adequate opportunities for staff development, collaboration periods, parent involvement, etc. to implement congruence.

New York State is committed to excellence and equal opportunity. Congruence is a system of linkage among the people and programs at every level dedicated to helping all young people achieve. State Education Department staff, school district administrators, support teachers, and classroom teachers are challenged to critically assess developmental classroom instruction and support service instruction to determine whether they are effectively coordinated, and to work cooperatively to improve the classroom performance of all students.

# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX A

# LEGAL CITATIONS

1. New York State Commissioner's Regulations - Part 149-1.4(h) District Plan 9/87 (PSEN)

   ...Each district plan shall be in a form prescribed by the Commissioner, shall constitute the comprehensive project application for remedial instruction, shall be consistent with the provisions of the Part and...of this Chapter and shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

   (h) a description of how other available funds will be coordinated with this special apportionment to provide a unified comprehensive program of remedial instruction for all eligible pupils in the district.

2. Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988 - Sections 1001(b) and 1012(c)(3) (Chapter 1)

   The reauthorized Chapter 1 law states: "The purpose of assistance under this Chapter is to improve the educational opportunities of educationally deprived children by helping such children succeed in the regular program of the local educational agency...(the) application shall provide assurance that the programs and projects described...allocate time and resources for frequent and regular coordination of the curriculum under this Chapter with the regular instructional program...."

3. Guidance from SED with 1988-1991 Chapter 1/PSEN Application

   In New York State, "congruence" is used to express a commitment to the spirit and the letter of the law calling for coordination, cooperation, focused instruction, and the elimination of fragmented approaches. Congruence is a process that provides linkage between the developmental and compensatory programs in a district.

4. New York State Comprehensive Compensatory Education Plan, Chapter 1/PSEN, 1988-1991

...Each district plan to be submitted to (SED) for approval must include...Section 1 Program Narrative containing...information on the amount of time and resources and proposed activities, including a timeline for such activities over the next three years, to insure articulation/coordination (congruence) between the developmental and remedial programs, both districtwide and at the school building level.

5. New York State Commissioner's Regulations - Part 149-3.3 District Plan 9/87 (PCEN)

District Plan. (a) Each city school district in a city with a population in excess of 125,000 inhabitants and each community school district in the City of New York that receives an apportionment of State aid for pupils with compensatory educational needs pursuant to Education Law, section 3602(20) or an apportionment of State aid for pupils with special educational needs shall prepare and submit to the commissioner a single comprehensive district plan which describes the use of both such apportionments... Each district plan shall include ...

(3) a description of how the use of appropriate federal funds is coordinated with the instructional programs and services described in the district plan;

(13) a description of how the compensatory instruction and services will be coordinated with the instructional program provided in the regular classroom and with other programs providing the compensatory services specified in paragraph (b) of subdivision 1-a of section 3602 of the Education Law, including a description of how delivery of services and assessment procedures will be planned and coordinated among the regular classroom teachers and remedial teachers, and, as appropriate, with the support services personnel funded from State apportionments for attendance improvement and dropout prevention and educationally related support services.

6. Amendment to New York State Commissioner's Regulations - Section 100.2(v)(7), Annual Program Report, 9/86 (Educationally Related Support Services)

...The superintendent of schools shall submit an annual program report to the commissioner in a form prescribed by the commissioner... Such reports shall contain an assurance that the educationally related support services have been coordinated to the maximum extent feasible with services available pursuant to other state, local and federally funded programs.

7. New York State Education Law - Section 3602-a(3)(e) and (h), (Youth-At-Risk)

(e) Comprehensive plans to serve youth-at-risk... The plan shall... (3) provide for the coordination of educational support services...

(h) Criteria for approval... Such supplemental services shall be coordinated with the regular educational program and shall not duplicate services provided with funds from other sources...

8. Amendment to New York State Commissioner's Regulations - Section 175.23(c)(1)(v), District Plan, 9/88 (Attendance Improvement and Dropout Prevention)

Each participating school district shall submit to the commissioner for approval a plan... which includes... the manner in which the programs and services developed to improve attendance and retention of identified students are coordinated with... other federal, state or locally funded school programs including, but not limited to stay in school partnership programs, ECIA Chapter 1 programs, programs for pupils with special educational needs, and educationally related support programs...

# APPENDIX B

# RESEARCH FINDINGS

Some research has demonstrated that greater potential for improvement in student achievement occurs when all staff involved in delivering instruction coordinate their efforts purposefully and frequently. The U.S. Department of Education, in a 1987 national review of successful compensatory education programs, identified coordination as one of the characteristics of the "Effective Schools" model (U.S. Department of Education Effective Compensatory Education Sourcebook, Volume 1: A Review of Effective Educational Practices, page 30).

A recent study by Birman (1988) further supports the idea that coordination of instruction between compensatory and developmental classrooms facilitates learning. This is reported in an article in the American Educator, describing the findings of the U.S. Department of Education's "National Assessment of Chapter 1." The recommendation that Chapter 1 programs become more closely linked with regular programs is included as one of the educational practices that most improve the achievement of disadvantaged children. Current findings indicate that this link is often missing.

Instead of different curricula, Allington and Shake (1986) recommend coordination of instruction between the classroom and compensatory teachers to support mastery of the core curriculum. Walp and Walmsley (1989) urge educators to go even a step further with coordination. While recognizing the importance of having procedures for coordinating instruction, districts are also asked to consider instructional and philosophical aspects of the classroom and compensatory programs in order to achieve more than "pro-forma" congruence.

Failure to align curricula may result in a fragmented instructional program which, in turn, may cause "cognitive confusion" in the learning of special needs students (Allington and Shake, 1986). M.D. Vernon had warned of this situation for special needs students in 1958 in Backwardness in Reading. John Downing echoed this in Reading and Reasoning (1979), arguing that exposure to different instruction in two settings involving different goals and materials confuses the remedial student.

There has been consistent documentation within the past few years indicating a lack of regular coordination between the core curriculum of the general education classroom and the compensatory and/or special education reading program in a building (Cohen, 1982; Johnston, et.al., 1985; Allington and Shake, 1986). Often teachers appear to have no common instructional framework to guide collaborative program planning. Allington

and Shake (1986) reported that in many schools in which they served as consultants, "students and parents...perceive no relationship between what is presented in a general education class and what is taught in the remedial or special class."

Johnston, Allington and Afflerbach (1985) in an article entitled "The Congruence of Classroom and Remedial Instruction," present the findings of a study indicating that, typically, the classroom teacher and the remedial teacher have different instructional goals for the same student on the same day. The different goals, approaches, and materials used in each setting result in a fragmented instructional program for the compensatory student. Will (1986) in an assessment of where we stand in educating students with learning problems, reports that two of the major "obstacles" to effective education of students with learning problems are identified as the "fragmented approach" and the "dual system" of special programs. Both of these characteristics have contributed to the lack of coordination and unclear lines of responsibility found in compensatory instruction.

When programs are <u>not</u> congruent, the following conditions can be observed:

- Compensatory education programs become a revolving door for students who do well in the "pullout" program and exit, only to return to the compensatory program at a later time.

- Students often remain in pull-out programs for three or more years because there is little transfer of success into the regular program.

- Poor coordination exists with parents, pupil personnel staff, nonpublic school teachers, and other special programs.

- Achievement is not sustained in the regular program.

- There is not an identifiable curriculum in the regular core program with which to coordinate the compensatory activities.

- There are not identifiable learning outcomes for specific developmental levels in the classroom program to which individual compensatory students should relate.

- Adequate time is not provided in schedules for "meaningful" collaboration.

- Adequate procedures are not available to evaluate objectively the success of compensatory education students in the regular classroom program on a consistent basis.

Numerous national committees have recommended the need for excellence in education for all students. To achieve this, educators have urged special and general education professionals to combine their efforts and implement a coordinated system to meet the needs of all students (Stainback, 1984; Will, 1986; Reynolds, 1987).

Although much of the research on congruence has occurred in the instructional area of reading, findings can be applied in other areas. The concept of coordinating compensatory and developmental programs is valuable regardless of the subject. Students in Special Education and Bilingual Education, as well as those in subject areas such as mathematics and writing, will benefit greatly from careful articulation and coordination.

# APPENDIX C

## REFERENCES


Allington, R.L., & Broikou, K. (1988). Development of shared knowledge: a new role for classroom and specialist teachers. The Reading Teacher, 41, 806-811.

Allington, R.L., & Johnston, P.H. (1988). Coordination, collaboration & consistency: the redesign of compensatory and special education interventions. In R. Slavin, N. Madden, & N. Karweit (Eds.), Preventing School Failure: Effective Programs for Students at Risk.

Allington, R.L., & Shake, M.C. (1986). Remedial reading: achieving curricular congruence in classroom and clinic. The Reading Teacher, 39, 648-653.

Birman, B.F. (1988, Spring). How to improve a successful program. American Educator, 22-29.

Carroll, J. (1963). A model of school learning. Teachers College Record, 64, 723-733.

Cohen, E.G., Intili, J.K., & Robbins, S.H. (1978). Teachers and reading specialists: cooperation or isolation? The Reading Teacher, 32, 281-287.

Downing, J. (1979). Reading and Reasoning. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Hannifin, M.J., & Barrett, B.K. (1983). Preparing for educational change; incorporating the support curriculum into the basic curriculum. American Educator, 7, 32-37.

Johnston, P.H., Allington, R.L., & Afflerbach, P. (1985). The congruence of classroom and remedial instruction. The Elementary School Journal, 85, 465-478.

Leinhardt, G., Bickel, W., & Pallay, A. (1982). Unlabeled but still entitled: toward more effective remediation. Teachers College Record, 84, 391-422.

Reynolds, M.C., Wana, M.C., & Walberg, H.J. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 53, 391-398.

Sanacore, J. (1987). Needed: a better link between the learning center and the classroom. Unpublished manuscript, Hofstra University, Hempstead, NY.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 51, 102-111.

Stallings, J. (1980). Allocated academic learning time revisited, or beyond time on task. Educational Researcher.

Vanecko, J., Ames, N., & Archambault, F. (1980). Who benefits from federal education dollars? The development of ESEA Title I allocation policy. Cambridge, MA: Abt. Associates, Inc.

Vernon, M.D. (1958). Backwardness in reading. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Walp, T.P., & Walmsley, S.A. (1989). Instructional and philosophical congruence: neglected aspects of coordination. The Reading Teacher, 42, 364-368.

Will, M. (1986). Educating students with learning problems: a shared responsibility. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.